UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,690	06/27/2003	Ram Gopal Lakshmi Narayanan	042933/263792	9684

826   7590   04/10/2007

ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER
WILLIAMS, JEFFERY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/608,690	NARAYANAN, RAM GOPAL LAKSHMI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffery Williams	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 January 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 January 2007</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

1   **DETAILED ACTION**

2

3   This action is in response to the communication filed on 1/8/07.

4   All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

5   Claims 1 – 20 are pending.

6

7   ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

8

9   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

10   forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

11   application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

12   forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

13   has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/8/07

14   has been entered.

15

16   ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

17

18   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

19   form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

20   A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

21   (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
22   use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
23   States.
24
25

1   Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boden

2   et al. (Boden), "System and Method for Managing Security Objects", U.S. Patent 6,330,

3   562.

4

5   Regarding claim 1, Boden discloses:

6   *providing a plurality of security policies (7:51-58), wherein each security policy*

7   *includes an application instance identifier associated with a security service, at least two*

8   *application instance identifiers being associated with different security services that*

9   *operate according to different protocols (3:61-64; 4:17-23; 7:29-29; 12:60-13:5).* Boden

10   discloses that each application (i.e. an IKE application and an VPN manager

11   application) may identify, within a policy, to the system to employ IPSec as a way of

12   providing security services. Each of the plurality of established policies may have

13   associated with them differing security services (6:52-67).

14   *and creating at least one security association, wherein the at least one security*

15   *association is created based upon the at least one security service (2:3-8) associated*

16   *with at least one application instance identifier to thereby create a centralized key store*

17   *including the plurality of security policies and the at least one security association (figs.*

18   *3-3d; 3:23-36).*

19

20   Regarding claims 6 and 11 they are rejected, at least, for the same reasons as

21   claim 1, and because Boden further discloses:

1   *a first security gateway configured for providing a plurality of security policies* (fig.

2   1:18, 19) ... wherein the first security gateway is configured for *applying a security*

3   *service associated with an identified* (7:29-29; 12:60-13:5) *application instance identifier*

4.   *to at least one packet of data to thereby transform the at least one packet of data,*

5   *wherein the first security gateway is configured for applying the security service to the at*

6   *least one packet based upon at least one security policy and at least one security*

7   *association* (fig. 1; 3:60-4:4; 6:13-31; 11:table 1); *and a second security gateway*

8   *configured for applying the security service associated with the identified application*

9   *instance identifier to the at least one transformed packet of data to thereby generate a*

10   *representation of the at least one packet of data* (fig. 1; 3:60-4:4; 6:13-31; 11:table 1);

11

12

13   Regarding claims 2, 3, 9, 12, and 14, Boden further discloses a system

14   comprising sending and receiving gateways. Each gateway further comprises a

15   VPN/user application capable of creating and accessing policies within a policy

16   definition database (3:60-4:16). Both the sending and receiving gateways receive and

17   transmit packets of which are transformed upon transmission or reception according to

18   (application identified) security services between nodes (3:1-20; 3:60-4:16; fig. 1).

19

20   Regarding claims 4, 8, and 13, Boden further discloses:

21   *at least one security policy further including at least one selector field having at*

22   *least one selector value in a format common to a plurality of security service protocols,*

and wherein applying the security service comprises applying the security service

further based upon the at least one security policy including the at least one selector

value (11:table 1; figs. 3-3d; 13:13-50; 13:62-14:25). Boden discloses a security policy

having common selector fields in addition to the application defined identifiers, wherein

security services are based upon the selector fields.

Regarding claims 7, it is rejected, at least, for the same reasons as claims 1 and

6.

Regarding claims 5, 10, and 15, Boden further discloses *creating at least one*

security association according to an Internet Key Exchange (IKE) technique (3:60-4:16).

Regarding claims 16 – 20, they are the features and limitations of the above

rejected claims embodies as computer instructions upon a medium. Thus, they are

rejected, at least, for the same reasons as the above rejected claims, and further

because Boden discloses *a computer program product for creating and maintaining a*

centralized key store (15:62-16:6).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/8/07 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

1   Applicant argues primarily that:

2

3   (i)   *In no event, however, does Boden disclose applying a security service other than*

4   *IPSec such that the security policies include application instance identifiers associated*

5   *with security services.* (Remarks, pg. 11)

6

7   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

8   features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

9   (i.e., *applying a security service other than IPSec such that the security policies include*

10   *application instance identifiers associated with security services*) are not recited in the

11   rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

12   limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

13   F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

14

15   (ii)   *In accordance with the present invention, on the other hand, IPSec is but one of*

16   *a number of different security services that may be implemented using the claimed*

17   *centralized key store* (Remarks, pg. 11).

18

19   In response, the examiner respectfully notes that the applicant's arguments

20   appear to be base upon a misinterpretation of IPSEC. Applicant is respectfully invited

21   to review evidentiary teachings concerning IPSEC (Kent et al., RFC 2401, "Security

22   Architecture for the Internet Protocol", 1998, pgs. 1-66). Boden teaches inter alia the

1   use of IPSEC. As is known to those of ordinary skill in the art, IPSEC is a security

2   architecture. This framework enables to provision of a *plurality of security services that*

3   *operate according to a plurality of protocols.*

4

5

6   ***Conclusion***

7

8   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

9   applicant's disclosure:

10   ***see Notice of References Cited***

11

12   A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire **3** months (not less than 90

13   days) from the mailing date of this communication.

14   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

15   examiner should be directed to Jeffery Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-

16   7965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

17   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

18   supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

19   number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)

20   872-9306.

1   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

2   Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

3   published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

4   Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

5   For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

6   you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

7   Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

8

9
10   J. Williams
11   AU 2137
12

MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137